

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

One replacement drawing sheet is attached. Replacement sheet 1 (labeled "2/5") corrects Figure 4 to include boldfaced characters as shown on the drawings as filed and which were unintentionally omitted in the formal drawings submitted on January 22, 2002. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added as a result of this amendment.

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 remain in the present application. Claims 1-13 are amended herein. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added as a result of the claim amendments. Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration of the rejections based on the amendments and arguments set forth below.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Number 6,952,521 to Kelly et al. (hereafter referred to as “Kelly”) in view of United States Patent Number 6,031,960 to Lane (hereafter referred to as “Lane”). Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1-13 are not rendered obvious by Kelly in view of Lane for the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to independent Claim 1 that recites a method for performing smooth search transitions in a DVD system comprising (emphasis added):

- (a) calculating an instantaneous frame rate to produce a calculated instantaneous frame rate;
- (b) adjusting a timestamp of a frame based on the calculated instantaneous frame rate to produce an adjusted timestamp; and
- (c) displaying the frame according to the adjusted timestamp.

Claims 2-4 depend from independent Claim 1 and recite further limitations to the claimed invention. Claims 6-9 depend from independent Claim 5 and recite further limitations to the claimed invention. Claims 11-13 depend from independent Claim 10 and recite further limitations to the claimed invention.

The rejection states that Kelly fails to teach or suggest the limitations of “calculating an instantaneous frame rate to produce a calculated instantaneous frame rate,” “adjusting a timestamp of a frame based on the calculated instantaneous frame rate to produce an adjusted timestamp” and “displaying the frame according to the adjusted timestamp” as recited in independent Claim 1. Applicants concur.

Applicants respectfully submit that that Lane, either alone or in combination with Kelly, fails to cure the deficiencies of Kelly discussed above with respect to independent Claim 1. Specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that Lane also fails to teach or suggest the limitation of a “calculating an instantaneous frame rate to produce a calculated instantaneous frame rate” as recited in independent Claim 1. Applicants understand the cited portion of Lane to teach determining a hold time for video frames during “trick play” operation (col. 9, lines 44-65). Lane goes on to teach that an average hold time shall be calculated such that the trick play datastream shall playback at a “preselected” speed (col. 10, lines 11-30). As such, Lane teaches away from the claimed embodiments by teaching the determining of a fixed, “preselected” frame rate instead of an instantaneous frame rate as claimed.

Applicants respectfully submit that Lane also fails to teach or suggest the limitations of “adjusting a timestamp of a frame based on the calculated instantaneous frame rate to produce an adjusted timestamp” and “displaying the frame according to the adjusted timestamp” as recited in independent Claim 1. As discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that Lane fails to teach or suggest calculating an instantaneous frame rate. Consequently, Applicants

respectfully submit that Lane also fails to teach or suggest adjusting a timestamp of a frame based on the calculated instantaneous frame rate as claimed. Furthermore, in light of Lane's failing to teach or suggest adjusting a timestamp based on a calculated instantaneous frame rate as claimed, Applicants also respectfully submit that Lane also fails to teach or suggest displaying the frame according to its adjusted time stamp as claimed.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Lane fails to teach or suggest "determining a change in rate between a current frame rate and a new frame rate" as recited in dependent Claim 2. As recited in the present application, an instantaneous frame rate is calculated in part by determining a change in frame rate to enable smooth transitions between frame rates.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants understand Lane to teach the recording of a trick play data stream onto tape media, where the trick play data stream includes frames for fast forward or reverse playback (Abstract). And as discussed above with regard to independent Claim 1, Lane teaches that the fast forward or reverse playback during trick play operation is at a fixed, preselected speed. As such, Lane effectively teaches away from the claimed embodiments by teaching fixed frame rate playback instead of smooth transitioned playback between frame rates as claimed.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 1 is not rendered obvious by Kelly in view of Lane, thereby overcoming the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of record. Since independent Claims 5 and 10 contain limitations similar to those discussed above with respect to independent Claim 1, independent Claims 5 and 10 also overcome the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of

record. Since Claims 2-4, 6-9 and 11-13 depend from and recite further limitations to the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, Claims 2-4, 6-9 and 11-13 also overcome the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of record. Thus, Claims 1-13 are therefore allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-13 are in condition for allowance and Applicants earnestly solicit such action from the Examiner.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 23-0085.

Please direct all correspondence to the below-listed address:

Anthony C. Murabito
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP

Dated: 6/14, 2006

BMF

Bryan M. Failing
Registration No. 57,974

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060